

REMARKS

Claims 19-33 remain pending in the application, withdrawn claims 1-18 and 34-41 being canceled subsequent to having been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner.

Claims 19-33 over Oehrke

Claims 19-33 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 7,047,300 to Oehrke ("Oehrke"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 19-33 require an authenticator to authenticate a particular source of a message before the message is routed by the message router between a protocol gateway and a server.

The Examiner cites Oehrke's router 51 and server 76 (shown in Fig. 3), and specific disclosure at col. 7, lines 56-60; col. 8, lines 2-9 and 38-40; and col. 9, lines 19-41, for allegedly disclosing the invention of claims 19-33. In the Examiner's Response to Arguments in the Final Office Action, the Examiner is admittedly "confused as to why applicant feels the user is not the originator of the message. One of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize that if a user creates a message, that user is the originator of the message." (Final Office Action at 3).

The "user" in this context is what Oehrke refers to as a user. Oehrke's "user" as discussed by Oehrke is "company A" attempting to gain access to a data center 52. Company A is a broad source of a message that many particular sources can use to send a message. Company A is not a particular source of a message that is being routed, as recited by claims 19-33.

For this reason alone claims 19-33 are patentable.

Moreover, claims 19-33 not only require authentication of a particular source of a message, but authentication of the particular source of a message before the message is routed by a message router.

Not only does Oehrke fail to disclose authentication of a **particular source** of a message, Oehrke further fails to disclose such authentication of the

particular source of a message before the message is routed.

Oehrke explains that the data center provides various applications and associated data for customers or owners, e.g., company A, who may use the data center for its intranet network. (Oehrke, col. 7, lines 42-45). Once company A has been authenticated, then the "users of intranet network 54 are provided with access to the data center 52." (Oehrke, col. 7, lines 48-50).

Oehrke authenticates that the NETWORK has access to use resources on a mirrored network—not the **particular source** of a message that is attempting to be routed, much less the **particular source** of a message BEFORE it is routed, as claimed by claims 19-33.

For at least all the above reasons, claims 19-33 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307
WHB/df